

**J.C. PATENTS**  
4 VENTURE, SUITE 250  
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92618, U.S.A.  
TEL.: (949) 660-0761, FAX: (949) 660-0809  
E-mail: jcpi@email.msn.com

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**AUG 08 2005**

**August 8, 2005**  
**BY FACSIMILE FOLLOWED BY COURIER**

**URGENT**

Mr. Wilson H.L. Lee  
Jiang Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7F. -1, NO. 100, Roosevelt Rd., Sec. 2  
Taipei, Taiwan R.O.C.

Re : U.S. Patent Application

Title : MOTHERBOARD WITH REDUCED POWER CONSUMPTION  
Application No. : 10/005,627  
Filed : December 4, 2001  
Our Reference No. : JCLA6879  
Your Reference No. : 06879-US-PA

Dear Wilson:

We recently received an Advisory Action from United States Patent and Trademark Office regarding the above-identified application, indicating the **AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL** previously filed **will not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search**. Please see the attached Advisory Action for detail.

If the Applicant does not wish to abandon this application, there are several options you may consider, including:

- (a) file a Request for Continued Examination(RCE), or a continuation application, or
- (b) file a continuation-in-part application (CIP),

If you choose to file a RCE or a continuation application, no new matters can be added and no new Declaration is required. For filing a CIP, a new Declaration is needed, and you can add new materials to the application (the newly added materials will not enjoy the priority benefit of the parent application.).

A CIP or RCE has to be filed while the present application is pending, i.e., no later than **October 28, 2005** in order to claim the priority benefit of the present application. However, it should be filed as soon as possible to avoid or save the time extension fee.

We look forward to receiving your further instructions. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

  
Jiawei Huang

Enclosures



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,627	12/04/2001	Nai-Shung Chang	JCLA6879	8225
23900	7590	08/04/2005	EXAMINER	
J C PATENTS, INC. 4 VENTURE, SUITE 250 IRVINE, CA 92618			CHEN, TSE W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005

Advisory  
Drop: 10-28-2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

### Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/005,627

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Tse Chen

Art Unit

2116

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 8-16.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

LYNNE H. BROWNE  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment stipulating that "the control signal opens the plurality of switches to cut off the coupling between the memory module slot and the voltage source" would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed July 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant alleges that "it is obvious that a skilled person would not have the motivation to combine Fan and Taguchi ... because Fan did not disclose any suggestion or motivation for power conservation". Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner submits that the explicit motivation to reduce power consumption, a desirable aspect known to one of ordinary skill in the art, was found in Taguchi [col. 1, l.65- col.2, l.11; col.2, l.50 - col.3, l.2; col.5, ll.33-48]. Applicant alleges that in Fan, "only a single termination resistor is disclosed". Examiner disagrees and submits that Fan does disclose a plurality of termination resistors as discussed in the rejection. Furthermore, Applicant did not dispute the fact that a single resistor may embody a plurality of resistors according to Kirchhoff's Law. Applicant alleges that Taguchi "does not clearly disclose the connection between the switch and the termination resistor". Examiner disagrees and submits that Taguchi does disclose the connection between the switch and the termination resistor as discussed in the rejection. Applicant alleges that neither Fan nor Taguchi "discloses how the control signal commands the switch to cut off the connection between the termination resistor and the voltage when the memory module is not inserted in the memory module slot... it is advised that a power saving mode is not always the same as an empty memory module slot mode". Examiner submits that the rejection is valid since the limitation specifically states that the control signal commands the switch to cut off the connection between the termination resistor and the voltage "when the motherboard enters a power saving mode OR when the memory module is not inserted in the memory module slot". As demonstrated above, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejections are respectfully maintained.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**